



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/516,176	03/01/00	SASAKI	PM 266297

000909  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
1600 TYSONS BOULEVARD  
MCLEAN VA 22102

IM52/1023

EXAMINER

LE, H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 10/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/516,176

Applicant(s)  
Sasaki et al

Examiner  
H. Thi Le

Art Unit  
1773



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE one MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Election/Restriction***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-3, 16, 17, 20-22, drawn to a powder (hollow and flaky), classified in class 428, subclass 402.
  - II. Claims 4-6, 8 and 9, drawn to a process of making a hollow powder by spray drying, classified in class 34, subclass 372.
  - III. Claim 7, drawn to an exfoliated titania sol, classified in class 252, subclass 378R.
  - IV. Claims 10-12 and 14, drawn to a process of producing an exfoliated titania sol, classified in class 423, subclass 608.
  - V. Claim 13, drawn to a mixed alkali metal titanate, classified in class 423, subclass 69.
  - VI. Claim 15, drawn to a layered titanic acid compound, classified in class 556, subclass 54.
  - VII. Claims 18 and 19, drawn to a process of making a flaky powder, classified in Class 34, subclass 387.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process

as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another materially different process such as blowing and drying a titania gel.

Inventions I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as precursor for a ceramic composite and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have

different functions. The hollow powder of invention I cannot be made by the process of making a sol form of titania of invention IV.

Inventions I and V and inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they have different functions and effects. The mixed metal of invention V and the layered compound of invention VI are chemically and structurally different from that hollow powder of invention I, thus they naturally have different functions and effects.

Inventions I and VII are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the flaky powder as claimed can be made by another materially different process such as depositing a layer of titania on a substrate and breaking off the layer to form flakes.

Inventions II and III and inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the method of making hollow powder of invention I

cannot be used to produce the product of invention III. Thus they are not disclosed to be capable of use together and thus they have different functions. The invention II is in turn unrelated to the process of invention IV which produces product of invention III.

Inventions II and V and inventions II and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of making hollow powder of invention I cannot be used to produce the product of invention V or invention VI. Thus they have different functions and effects.

Inventions II and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation because they employ different process steps and produce structurally different products.

Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In

the instant case, the process as claimed can be used to make a materially different product such as exfoliated graphite sol.

Inventions III and V and inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they have different functions and effects. The mixed metal of invention V and the layered compound of invention VI are chemically and structurally different from that exfoliated gel of invention III, thus they naturally have different functions and effects.

Inventions III and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together because the pulverizing process of invention VII cannot be used to produce a gel product such as invention III. Thus they have different functions.

Inventions IV and V and inventions IV and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable to

use together because the method of invention IV cannot be used to produce materials of inventions V and VI. Therefore, naturally these inventions have different effects.

Inventions IV and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they are not disclosed as capable of use together because the method of invention IV and VII produce two materially and structurally different products. Thus, they have different functions and effects.

Inventions V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they have different functions and effects. The mixed metal of invention V and the layered compound of invention VI are chemically and structurally different, thus they naturally have different functions and effects.

Inventions V and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they are not disclosed as capable of use together. The method of invention VII cannot be used to produce material of inventions V. Therefore, naturally these inventions have different effects.



Inventions VI and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because they are not disclosed as capable of use together. The method of invention VII cannot be used to produce material of invention VI. Therefore, naturally these inventions have different effects.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because the complicated nature in grouping of the instant claims as shown by several different classifications, a written restriction requirement is deemed appropriate.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *H. Thi Le* whose telephone number is (703)308-2415. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

The fax phone number is (703) 872-9610.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Thi Le', written over a horizontal line.

*H. Thi Le*  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 1773**

October 21, 2001